

Throughout this document, the Oregon Health Authority has been tasked with design standards for containers, trigger locks, and cable locks. If it is this legislature's learned opinion that the Oregon Health Authority possesses the expertise and professional qualifications to carry out this task, then when is the Oregon State Police going to start selling supplemental health insurance coverage? It would appear they have as much experience in the area of health insurance as the Oregon Health Authority does in designing firearm locks and storage containers.

To require a trigger or cable lock be installed on a firearm while it is being carried in the purse of an authorized female CHL holder, renders the firearm useless in terms of self-defense. Unless of course, you're going to pass a law mandating all rapists, murderers and physical assaulters give the intended victim a two-minute warning before they attack, allowing for time to remove the locking device.

The two-year liability clause appearing throughout leads to questions concerning this document writer's cognitive abilities. If a firearm is stolen, it is most assuredly stolen so that it can be sold, traded, or used to "injure a person or property". Do members of this legislative body honestly think any of these locking devices are going to prevent a determined thief from removing them with any means at his disposal? Assume for this example a reported stolen firearm from two years ago was recovered from the perpetrator at the scene of a murder. Who has the burden of proof that it was properly secured at the time of theft? If the murderer says it wasn't, is the state going to take his or her word for it? Is there now going to be a requirement to have a date/time-stamped video as proof that it was secured at the time of its theft?

This proposed legislation reads like a one-way ticket to the Supreme Court.

Resident of Lane County Oregon